

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/886,175	06/20/2001	David M. Teter	SD6785/S96438	5991	
75	90 03/01/2005		EXAMINER		
Timothy D. Stanley			CINTINS, IVARS C		
Sandia National Laboratories P.O. Box 5800 - MS-0161			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	NM 87185-0161		1724		
			DATE MAILED: 03/01/2009	DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Author Occurrence	09/886,175	TETER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ivars C. Cintins	1724	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence ac	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.12 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status ·			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 Fe	ebruary 2005.		
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>5-8</u> is/are withdrawn	from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 9-13</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acco			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- · ·	, ,	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		• •
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P	IO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicati	on No	
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the prior</li></ol>	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National	Stage
application from the International Bureau	` '/'		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.	
Attachment(s)			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate	D 152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	ателт Аррисацоп (РТС	J+134)

Application/Control Number: 09/886,175

Art Unit: 1724

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,830,695. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 12 and 13 of this application fully encompass claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,830,695.

Claims 1-4 and 9-13 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of copending Application Serial No. 10/955,292. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of this application are deemed to be obvious variations of the claims in copending Application Serial No. 10/955,292. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Application/Control Number: 09/886,175 Page 3

Art Unit: 1724

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation that sorbent material has a "composition" including the recited divalent and trivalent metals and oxygen or sulfur (claim 1, line 5) does not appear to be supported by the disclosure originally filed, and hence constitutes **new matter**. The disclosure originally filed appears to support only <u>compounds</u>, not compositions, having the recited constituents (see page 1, line 10; and page 5, line 5, of the specification).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sood (U.S. Patent No. 4,752,397) or O'Neill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,935,146). Each of the

13.

references discloses removing arsenic anions from water (see col. 5, lines 1 and 26 of Sood; and col. 2, line 17 of O'Neill et al.) with a sorbent material containing a divalent metal ion, a trivalent metal ion and an oxygen species of the type recited (see col. 2, line 13 of Sood; and col. 4, line 62 through col. 5, line 53 of O'Neill et al.); and this is all that is required by claims 1-4, 9, 12 and

Claims 10 and 11 have not been rejected over "art" because the references of record do not teach or fairly suggest utilizing CuFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> in a water decontamination process of the type recited.

Applicants is advised that should claim 9 be found allowable, then claim 13 will be objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof, since claim 9 depends from claim 1 (see line 10), and therefore already contains the limitation that the sorbent material substantially removes the anionic contaminants from the water undergoing treatment. See M.P.E.P. § 706.03(k).

Manabe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,458,030) discloses removing arsenic anions (see col. 3, line 49) with a similar adsorbent material.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to I. Cintins whose telephone number is (571) 272-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Duane Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-1166.

The centralized facsimile number for the USPTO is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 1724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ivars C. Cintins
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

I. Cintins February 27, 2005